DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 060 850 JC 720 094

AUTHOR Gilley, J. Wade
TITLE Evaluation and Motivation of Community College Personnel.
INSTITUTION Center for State and Regional Leadership, Florida.; Florida Univ., Gainesville. Inst. of Higher Education.
PUB DATE May 72
NOTE 38p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Evaluation Methods; Faculty Evaluation; Institutional Role; *Junior Colleges; Merit Rating Programs; Models; Motivation; *Performance Criteria; *Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Motivation

ABSTRACT

This report deals with evaluating and motivating community college personnel. Following a discussion of the need for evaluation, a number of evaluation theories and practices are presented: rating systems, predictors of effectiveness, student evaluation, direct measurement, and merit salary increases. The author then describes a theory of motivation and evaluation as a base for his performance evaluation model, which has four stages: a plan, institutional objectives, individual objectives, and actual evaluation. Five recommendations suggested for implementing a statewide plan of institutional evaluation and personnel motivation are: (1) development of institutional objectives; (2) description of the evaluation purpose as product improvement; (3) clarification of instructor responsibilities; (4) individualization of faculty evaluation; and (5) development of long and short range objectives for individual commitment to the institution and evaluation development. (AL)

ED 060850

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EVALUATION AND MOTIVATION

OF

COMMUNITY COLLEGE PERSONNEL

By

J. Wade Gilley

Institute of Higher Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

May, 1972

A publication of the Center for State and Regional Leadership
(University of Florida/Florida State University)
with the help of a grant from the
W. K. Kellogg Foundation

JC 720 094

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	v
CHAPTER ONE - THE NEED FOR EVALUATION	1
CHAPTER TWO - THEORIES AND PRACTICES IN EVALUATION	5
Rating Systems	6
Predictors of Effectiveness	7
Student Evaluation	8
Direct Measurement	9
Merit Salary Increases	10
A National Survey	10
Summary	11
CHAPTER THREE - A THEORY OF MOTIVATION AND EVALUATION	13
CHAPTER FOUR - PERFORMANCE EVALUATION - A MODEL	20
A Plan	20
Institutional Objectives	21
Individual Objectives	23
Evaluation	25
CHAPTER FIVE - RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STATE SYSTEMS	27
FOOTNOTES	30
BIBLIOGRAPHY	32

FOREWORD

The most important factor in the development of community colleges is the continued improvement of teaching. These colleges have emphasized their teaching function in higher education to a greater extent than any other level of higher education. Some analysts have suggested that the community colleges have little reason to be proud of their teaching record while others have pointed to the data collected from student opinion polls which rated community college faculty unusually high. Without doubt, however, there is need to improve even if the latter assertion should be the correct one.

Dr. J. Wade Gilley, President, Wytheville Community College, has provided leadership in the development of an evaluation program which considers improvement of teaching as its major purpose. At the request of Chancellor Dana Hamel of the Department of Community Colleges of Virginia, Dr. Gilley spent a major portion of the winter quarter of 1972 working on this problem. This assignment was made possible through a short term fellowship from the University of Florida/Florida State University Center for State and Regional Leadership with help from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. It is a part of the program designed to provide in-service opportunities for state level leadership in the community colleges. This publication will be useful to such leadership in states in addition to Virginia.

We are appeciative of the contributions made to this study by Dr. Louis W. Bender, Florida State University; and Dr. Dayton Y. Roberts and Dr. Albert A. Canfield of the University of Florida.

James L. Wattenbarger
University of Florida

April, 1972

CHAPTER ONE

THE NEED FOR EVALUATION

In 1900, Dewey said that if education ever becomes a profession educators may be held accountable for their actions.[1] Certainly, as America moves into the 1970's, the "Age of Accountability" is upon educators and attention is being focused on productivity as well as products. Administrators and teachers at all levels of education are beginning to evaluate their effectiveness from both institutional and individual perspectives in an effort to be more accountable for those resources placed at their disposal.

Administrators now know that more and more money does not necessarily improve the learning process and are being forced to focus their attention on improving the productivity of the schools and colleges. One result of this awareness is the emphasis on evaluating the faculty as teachers. The public and the elected officials are demanding that more emphasis be placed on improving learning opportunities and that salary increases, promotion, and even retention be directly related to teacher effectiveness.

The past ten years has seen the formation of state-wide systems of institutions of higher education as legislators have sought to eliminate costly competition between colleges and to provide for more equitable distribution of resources. Some of these systems serve a coordinating function primarily while others have developed a highly structured centralized administration. In either case the central staff should

provide guidance and/or policies on a variety of issues facing institutions from student rights and responsibilities to academic freedom and personnel considerations. Personnel functions are necessarily of immediate concern to administrators at all levels of higher education.

During the immediate past two decades, America colleges and universities routinely solved many personnel problems by placing incompetent, unwanted, and strident faculty members on a nation-wide system of "Faculty Musical Chairs." This practice helped to establish a need for improved personnel evaluation throughout the country today.

The supply of instructors with even minimum academic qualifications became critical in the mid and late 1950's as the college age population began to boom, with a corresponding growth in college enrollments. The nation girded itself for the tremendous task of accommodating more students in institutions of higher education throughout the nation. New colleges, especially community colleges, were established at a rate of more than one per week while existing colleges and universities expanded at an unprecedented rate. During this same period business, government, and the defense industry expanded at a very rapid pace. The number of teaching positions rose at an unprecedented rate as a result of both the enrollment increase and a reduction in the student teacher ratio.

These factors created a critical shortage of college teachers, which in turn created the pressure to expand graduate schools to produce more and more instructors. The draft tended to keep capable young men within the security of the college setting, including graduate schools, to an unprecedented degree.

During this period if an instructor did not "work out" at a particular college, he could be rather easily persuaded to try his luck at another institution for there was little difficulty in finding a new position. It has been estimated that if one excluded faculty expansion the average annual turnover rate for faculty in American colleges may have been as high as 20 percent during the early 1960's. Also, the solution to as high as 80 percent of all personnel problems may have been solved via the musical chairs route.[2]

At the end of the decade of the 1960's, several important trends began to develop which altered and which continue to alter this situation. The student revolution, the trend toward the protection of individual rights, the peak of the enrollment growth, a slowing of the economy, a waning war, and the mass production of graduate degrees all combined to create a tremendous surplus of teachers at all levels of education and a reluctance to move on the part of those instructors with jobs.

What is the significance of all of this to college administrators? First, the traditional means of ridding the college of undesirable (for whatever reason) instructors via the musical chairs route has been virtually eliminated as an administrative tool. Administrators are finding that teachers are more and more resistant to being forced out. It has become necessary to actually prove a person incompetent in order to release him in a trend referred to as "Instant Tenure." In this light it is commonly conceded that proving a college teacher incompetent is near impossible.

The college administrator now may find it more feasible to "change the teachers" he has than to "change teachers." To be successful the educational administrator of the future, from the top down, must study and implement proven motivational

theories to change college personnel in an effort to develop a team committed to achieving the objectives of the system and the institution. He will work to develop and implement optimal educational opportunities with the existing faculty with a relatively low turnover rate.

This paper focuses on the development of a system of personnel performance evaluation which focuses on the development of faculty members as individuals. Also, there are recommended procedures for the implementation of such a system, along with suggestions for implementation of a program on a state-wide basis.

CHAPTER TWO

THEORIES AND PRACTICES IN EVALUATION

Administration and faculty alike, in an effort to respond to public needs, are experimenting with many variations of teacher evaluation. This renewed interest has resulted in the developing of many new programs. The following is a brief summary of the state of the art/science of appraisal of teacher effectiveness to date.

Appraisal of teaching personnel in the American institutions of higher education has in reality several purposes including the following: determination of salary increases, reappointment, and promotion. Perhaps, more important in recent times is the promotion of increased student learning. Evanko[3] defined the reasons for teacher evaluation in the community college in terms of three major objectives:

1. The improvement of teaching in the educational process;
2. To use the results for administrative purposes such as reappointment, promotion, tenure, course assignment, merit raises, curriculum and course revision, etc.;
3. To fulfill student needs such as selection of course and instructor, participation in course development, participation in developing media usage, and improvement in faculty-student interaction.

Cook and Neville[4] proposed three reasons for establishing teacher effectiveness guidelines in higher education: (1) Every teacher would benefit from a systematic appraisal of his or her efforts; (2) teaching--along with research and service--is

one of the three basic activities of a college or university professor and must be effectively performed; and (3) basic criteria for teaching performance need to be developed to insure that faculty are properly evaluated.

The most commonly used evaluation system to achieve these purposes is one of relative effectiveness which is usually based on supervisory, self, peer, or student opinion of teacher effectiveness. In some colleges efforts are being made to move toward direct measurement of teacher effectiveness; that is, the evaluation of teacher productivity (student learning). Teacher appraisal for whatever purpose usually makes use of rating scales, however, recently the concept of performance contracts (direct measurement) has come into limited usage.

Rating Systems

Relative appraisal (rating systems) of faculty is widely used in one form or another in two-year colleges and is essentially the opinion of the raters as to the relative effectiveness of those being evaluated. Rating scales are typically designed around certain indicators/predictors of faculty effectiveness such as classroom activities, course preparation, testing and grading procedures, etc. and may reflect student and peer opinion in addition to supervisory opinion.

When using a rating scale many college administrators practice classroom observation in an effort to determine the effectiveness of the instructor. It is probable that the intrusion of a third party into the teaching-learning environment creates an abnormal situation.

To the knowledge of this writer there have been no documented successes of predicting the degree of effectiveness of a teacher through the use of rating systems.

Biddle[5] reported that there had been few if any teacher traits, skills, or methodology which have been identified as good predictors of teacher effectiveness. The primary value in using rating systems and including the opinions of students, peers, and supervisors is to allow the teacher to see himself as others see him.

Predictors of Effectiveness

Increased productivity (learning) is an internal process which is influenced by external factors, and some educators do feel that the effect of this internal process can be improved if evaluation is developed around certain teaching practices which are normally assumed to be good for the learning situation. This theory assumes that there are traits which are common to a substantial majority of successful teachers; that is, teachers who are effective in causing learning. A study of evaluation of teaching by the Academic Senate of the Davis Campus, University of California, yielded five factors which summarize desirable teaching traits or skills.[6] These factors are as follows: (1) analytic/synthetic approach, (2) organization/clarity, (3) instructor-group interaction, (4) instructor-individual student interaction, and (5) dynamism/enthusiasm.

Colleges in their efforts to implement an evaluation program based on effectiveness indicators or predictors could well use these five general areas to establish a number of measurable objectives (indicators) for the teaching faculty. Communicate these to the faculty and then evaluate on the basis of them. For example, the college stressing specific behavioral objectives and a systems approach to instruction as a means of improving the teaching-learning process might well determine

the individual's contribution to the goals of the college through the evaluation of course planning and student evaluation. Of course, a program of this type needs an instrument designed around the indicators and is in reality just another form of rating scales.

This approach fails to take into account individual course and student population differences. It is difficult to avoid setting artificial standards for faculty and also administrators, in the main, do not appear to be sufficiently well organized to gather the necessary data to implement such a program. In addition, such programs may tend to limit the freedom of the instructor to present his course in a way best suited to his own abilities and the abilities of a particular class.

Student Evaluation

There are many student evaluation instruments such as the Purdue Rating Scale for Instruction which can be very valid in course evaluation as well as teacher evaluation. Most instruments utilized in student evaluation are used to determine student opinion of a number of teacher characteristics: teaching methods, class organization, etc. Student evaluation is valuable as it gives the individual instructor an opportunity to see himself as the students see him. After review of the literature concerning student evaluation, one has to conclude that if one is to use such an instrument for the evaluation of teachers or of instruction, it would be wise to utilize a well established instrument and to make the procedures and guidelines for the use of such an instrument clear to all concerned.

Direct Measurement

The previous discussion centered around what is referred to by Cook and Neville[7] as indirect measurement; that is, a measure of what the teacher does to facilitate learning. For example, the teacher selects instructional objectives, selects course materials, establishes learning environment, prepares academically, organizes and presents material, diagnoses students and interacts with students, etc. Now, to move to what is referred to by these same two authors as direct measurement, the quantification of the effects of teaching which can be defined as the extent to which the students have learned what the teacher is trying to teach and is determined by the teacher, his peers, or other qualified judges.

Experimentation in this area has received some national attention[8] and is usually referred to as performance contracts which constitutes an approach to evaluation of teacher effectiveness which focuses on student learning and provides for essentially a contract between the teacher and his institution. In the typical contract the instructor agrees to guarantee that X percent of his students will be able to master the specific objectives of a certain course or courses. Usually, the instructor's merit pay increase depends upon the degree of fulfillment of the guarantee specified in the contract. Application of this means of evaluation has lacked the full utilization of an array of educational reforms such as individualized instruction, flexible scheduling, non-punitive grading, etc. which would seem to be essential to its success. Also, rigid imposition of such a program from the top has the potential of creating a climate which alienates faculty and by doing so college administrators may postpone for generations those very reforms they seek to implement.

Merit Salary Increases

Merit salary increases for teachers have been more and more the concern of boards, elected officials, and the public. In some circles the people are saying that the productivity of teachers must increase if salaries are to continue to increase at rates comparable to those experienced in recent years. The productivity referred to here is generally identified as increased student learning and not necessarily the teaching of more students. Institutions having a rank system including a variety of indicators have an elementary merit pay system even if there is a pay scale within the rank system. Generally the criteria used in rank systems tend to relate to assumed predictors of teacher performance or teacher effectiveness as well as factors such as years of experience and educational background.

A National Survey

To verify the findings in the literature in regard to practices and trends in the evaluation of two-year college faculty, Wytheville Community College personnel conducted a national survey in November and December of 1970. Seventy percent of 68 colleges in twelve states with well established two-year college systems replied to a questionnaire. The colleges were mostly well established comprehensive community colleges of a variety of sizes including some fifty percent in the one to two thousand student range.

It was found that even though in ninety percent of the colleges the immediate supervisor of the instructor and/or the Dean of Instruction assumed the bulk of the responsibility for faculty evaluation, surprisingly some fifty percent of the

colleges used student participation or peer opinion in faculty evaluation. Most colleges depended on reviewing the activities of instructors to evaluate their performance, and a surprisingly high percentage depended heavily on classroom visitation to evaluate the instructor.

A few colleges reported that they were attempting to develop a system which seeks to measure direct results of the teaching process--student learning. These colleges, some thirty percent, were identified as being among those who are in the vanguard of many innovations in instructional practices such as specific behavioral objectives, systems instruction, individualized instruction, non-punitive grading, etc.

Summary

Cohen and Brawer[9] reported on a very promising evaluation scheme being carried out at Golden West College (California). The plan essentially dealt with the instructors' commitment to and implementation of the objectives of instruction in the college. The program is actually the supervision of performance objectives rather than supervision of instruction and was based on data which indicates that where there are clear statements of objectives learning is enhanced.

Cohen and Brawer feel that, "Among investigators the use of student gain, short range objectives as a measure of teacher effectiveness, is generally acknowledged as being more valid than the use of criteria as, for example, teachers efforts extended for the various perceptions of observers."[10]

The need for faculty evaluation is critical. In the words of Roueche, et. al.[11] "Faculty members and administrators must change their attitudes and work together

to gear curriculum to student achievement, to define objectives, and to accept accountability for their efforts. By guaranteeing some form of minimal educational achievement they can turn their institution into places where learning takes place . . ." Cook and Neville[12] recommend that a first step toward evaluation of teacher performance by direct measurement of student learning might well be a combination of student evaluation and direct measurement.

There is no question but that most serious students of teaching and learning feel that a well designed method of measuring student learning is the only way to measure teacher effectiveness. The problem, then, for faculty and administrators is where to start and how to proceed to accomplish this objective.

CHAPTER THREE

A THEORY OF MOTIVATION AND EVALUATION

McGregor's Theory of Integration[13] holds that for an organization to be truly successful it must meet the needs of those individuals within the organization as well as the basic needs of the organization itself. The purpose of management by integration and self control advocated by McGregor is to create a situation whereby a subordinate can best achieve his personal goals by directing his efforts toward the objectives of the institution. This theory or concept of management is becoming increasingly important as individuals within organizations obtain more security through collective representation and increased awareness of individual rights which has been identified as a definite trend in all segments of American life in recent years especially in higher education.

When developing an evaluation policy, procedure, or practice for an institution such as a college, one should first consider the desired outcomes of such an action. What is to be achieved? Historically, the purpose of evaluation has been nebulous. It has in fact been construed to be a negative action by both the evaluator and the person being evaluated. Many evaluation policies in institutions of higher education might well have assumed that the behavior of the average instructor can be described by McGregor's Theory X,[14] that the average instructor prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has relatively little ambition, and wants security above all. This view is the traditional view that American management has had of

employees and concerns itself with the first two basic needs of man as described by Maslow,[15] that is, the physiological and safety needs. It does not concern itself with a higher level of needs such as social needs; the need for self respect and self confidence; or the need for status, recognition, and deserved respect of peers, i.e., self fulfillment.

Other college evaluation policies have viewed the college teacher as a self-motivating individual. Any individual who did not understand what was expected of him and did not move to meet this expectation was placed through a backward looking evaluation procedure on the so-called national faculty musical chairs. As has been previously discussed, this system worked very well while there was a shortage of college teaching faculty in the country, and the people who were not motivated to meet the needs of a particular institution could find employment elsewhere relatively easy. Now that faculty are finding it difficult to move from institution to institution because of: the surplus of teachers, a reluctance on the part of those with jobs to give them up, collective negotiations, and the protection of individual rights, college administrators are finding it more difficult to rid the institution of undesired individuals.

Because of these trends, college administrators through their evaluation processes must address themselves to the problem of motivation in the years ahead. An organization, if it is to meet its basic needs and be a successful organization, must have a high percentage of successful and highly motivated individuals who are capable of meeting the needs of the organization and at the same time meet their own needs.

Everyone recognizes the importance of motivation. Most would agree that motivation is a desire within the individual which needs the proper stimulation in order to set about a particular activity to accomplish a certain goal. When we are concerned about motivation we are concerned about creating the environment for proper stimulation.

No one can deny the importance of providing motivation for individuals. A teacher must motivate the learners, and in turn an administrator/manager must stimulate the employees/teachers. A doctor must motivate his patient, a lawyer must motivate the judge. And so, most people are involved with and concerned with motivation. This is becoming more and more true for the college administrator and will be a critical factor for successful college administrators in the years ahead.

College administrators must also realize that we all exist as a part of an economic and social society and that this involves a high degree of interdependence. Take for example the fact that in management situations subordinates are depending upon those above them in the chain of command. They must answer these people. However, to a larger degree every manager/administrator is depending on those below him in the chain of command to get the job done. If superiors do not depend on subordinates they will never get the organizational goals accomplished. We can easily see that motivation and interdependence go hand in hand and that both are extremely important in modern day society, especially in educational institutions.

A new theory of management has been developed as the result of experimental work begun in a Chicago Plant of Western Electric in the late 1920's, and which is identified as the Hawthorne Experiments.[16] In the Hawthorne Experiments, a

group of women were isolated in a control section, and efforts were made to increase their productivity through the continued improvement of certain environmental factors. However, to the surprise of the scientists, the productivity of the group increased regardless of whether the environmental factors were improved or not. What they found in the experiments was the beginnings of a theory entirely different from the economic creature that managers, sociologists, and psychologists had considered man to be for years. They found that he worked harder for reasons other than wanting to satisfy his hunger or his safety.

The women in the Hawthorne studies in reality increased their production because of pride and prestige. In other words, self esteem and self fulfillment stimulated them far more than did environmental factors. As a result of these and other studies, we have a new view of man which is expressed in McGregor's Theory Y assumptions:[17]

1. To man work is as natural as play or rest,

2. Man will exercise self direction and self control in the service of objectives to which he is committed.

3. Commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with achievement.

4. The average person learns under proper conditions not only to accept responsibility but to seek responsibility.

5. The capacity to exercise a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in the solution of organizational problems is widely not narrowly distributed in the population.

6. Under the conditions of modern American life the intellectual potentialities of the average person are only partially utilized.

In summary, for an institution to be viable and to meet the basic reasons for its existence it must have a management system which not only stimulates individuals within the organization to a commitment to the goals of the organization but which at the same time meets the needs of the individuals themselves.

The concept of management by objectives provides a basic vehicle by which colleges can develop a system of performance evaluation utilizing McGregor Theory Y description of man. This concept may be implemented essentially as follows: First, the goals and objectives of the organization within the circumscription of its basic purpose (reason for existence) are established and clearly communicated to everyone within the organization. Then individual departments/divisions are allowed to select those goals or objectives, which they feel they can best help the organization meet for concentration; and then individuals within the departments/divisions are allowed to select individual objectives which they feel that they can best help assist the department and the institution in meeting its accepted objectives for their attention. Evaluation is based on the degree of achievement of the selected performance objectives. It has been found that participation on the part of all individuals in the development of organizational objectives is conducive to commitment to those objectives.

Now what do these new theories of personnel motivation and evaluation mean for colleges and college administrators? Simply stated an evaluation system based on inextricably intertwined institutional and individual objectives which are designed to meet both the needs of the organization and the needs of the individual is essential for growth and development of both. Motivation of individuals to continuously improve their performance will be essential for continuing institutional growth and

development in the years ahead as former signs of growth such as buildings and enrollment become static and new indicators of growth such as quality instruction and service to students becomes more and more prominent.

The first step in evaluating for the purpose of improving the performance of those being evaluated should be to develop some guidelines or objectives for the program. Usually, a separate program of appraisal for promotion, reappointment, and tenure should exist, and there should be a close coordination between the two where appropriate. The following set of guidelines are suggested as a model for the development of a performance improvement evaluation program.[18]

1. Institutional and individual accountability for improvement in student learning should be the primary objective of evaluation.

2. The instructor and the college administration should have clear understanding of the instructor's duties and responsibilities.

3. Key performance objectives as related to the institution's goals should be mutually agreed upon and made the focus of the teacher-administrator attention during the year.

4. Individual faculty members performance evaluation should be closely related to these objectives.

5. Faculty evaluation should attempt to determine the degree to which objectives have been achieved.

As in most cases the difficulty arises when one attempts to convert principles into practice and this program is no different. Essentially the details of the implementation of a program of evaluation based on the previously outlined guidelines must be developed cooperatively between the administration and faculty of the college, because college goals and local conditions must be taken into account, and any program

of teacher evaluation must provide for cooperative development if it is to be acceptable to a majority of those directly affected. Realizing this need for cooperative development the following suggestions are offered for use in developing a program based on these objectives.

First, this type of evaluation should provide for an instrument which is representative of the goals and objectives of the institution and which provides for more anecdotal rather than all check list entries. Any promotion, reappointment, etc., evaluation instrument might well be a check list type.

Secondly, subject area supervisors should be used in a consultative role as the individual package of performance objectives is developed between the second level supervisor and the instructor. Also, the immediate supervisor (subject area) should provide coaching for each instructor during the year to assist the teacher in meeting his objectives.

Third, the institution should have a set of goals, both long range and immediate, to which the instructor can relate as he develops his program for the year. Educational leaders (board members, presidents, deans, etc.) must develop their skills in defining the objectives which must be achieved!

Finally, the evaluation process from top to bottom must be individualized so as to meet the specific needs of those who are evaluated. It is essential for a college to develop a program of performance evaluation which creates an atmosphere conducive to learning in the college.

CHAPTER FOUR

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION - A MODEL

A Plan

The performance evaluation program at Wytheville Community College is based on a philosophy which can best be described by the following quotation from the college's performance evaluation plan.[19] "The only person with which each individual can profitably compare himself is himself yesterday, and if a college is to continue to improve year by year, the individuals associated with it must improve from year to year." In other words the basic premise of the performance evaluation plan is that if each individual constantly improves his performance within a set of prescribed guidelines, the college itself will be strengthened on a continuing basis.

In this plan attention is focused upon the development and achievement of institutional and individual performance objectives. Institutional objectives are developed through a procedure which involves the total college family while individuals develop a package of personal performance objectives which relate to the institutional objectives. This allows the staff to participate in the setting of institutional objectives as well as choose those objectives which they feel that they can best assist the institution achieve. The plan also provides for consideration of student, faculty, self, and supervisory opinion of the individual's effectiveness and focuses on the use of performance objectives to individualize the personnel improvement and evaluation program.

Simply stated, the plan provides that each person with faculty rank develop a plan for the year which includes a set of some seven specific performance objectives which focus on improvement in his/her performance. This plan is approved by either the Dean of Instruction (in the case of teaching faculty) or the president and is stated in specific measurable terms including a plan of action designed to achieve the objectives. The program also provides for departmental objectives selected from the institutional objectives for departmental focus during the year. Individual objectives are not restricted to departmental objectives.

This plan, which can serve as a model for colleges wishing to develop a positive evaluation program, does not directly include provisions for reappointment, promotion, or tenure considerations. The three basic parts of the performance evaluation plan are institutional objectives, individual objectives, and evaluation.

Institutional Objectives

The first step in this approach to the evaluation of personnel through a management by objectives concept is the establishment of institutional objectives both long-range and short-range (one year) nature. Many colleges have experienced difficulty in establishing these objectives in such a way that a majority of the personnel are committed to them. The approach at Wytheville Community College has been to carefully examine the college's programs in light of its purpose (basic reason for existence) with emphasis on ways in which it can better deliver those educational services required in the various programs.

After careful examination of its purpose by the college's faculty and administrative staff, a two-pronged approach is taken to establish institutional objectives

which involves both the administrative structure of the college and the Faculty Government Association. After careful consideration and refinement a set of objectives are presented to the college's local board for formal adoption. The board then uses these objectives and the success of the administration and faculty in accomplishing the objectives as an integral part of the board's six-point program of college evaluation.[20]

To examine the purpose and programs of the college with emphasis on areas of needed improvement, the college's faculty and staff participate in a number of seminars which feature panels of persons who have a direct or indirect interest in the educational services of the college. The initial or keynote panel in 1971 consisted of the editor of a large Virginia newspaper and three national authorities on the community junior college movement. This panel in their presentation and discussions with college faculty set the tone for future seminars. Other seminars featured panels which consisted of representatives of the alumni, the student body, four-year colleges to which the college's graduates transfer, representatives of industry employing graduates of the occupational-technical programs, representatives of local public school systems, and a panel of representatives of social service agencies such as the Welfare Department, Health Department, the Regional Planning Commission, an area correctional institution, and local elected officials.

After a comprehensive look at the college, its existing and potential educational services and its successes and potentialities as seen by persons outside the institution itself, a set of institutional objectives were developed using a two-pronged approach. First, using the organizational structure of the college, ideas on areas

needing improvement were solicited and after the accumulation of numerous suggestions the college administration used professional discretion to establish five prime objectives. In addition, the Faculty Government Association, representing the college's teaching faculty, recommended objectives to the college's administration which were developed anonymously by a frequency response analysis.

The approach of the Faculty Government Association was simply to have each instructor to recommend ten objectives which were compiled with the ten most frequent objectives being resubmitted to the faculty for ranking in order of priority. The results of this exercise were reported to the administration. Then, the two most frequent objectives were selected by the administration as institutional objectives with the other eight being considered by the administration in the development of the other five institutional objectives. The two different approaches take place almost simultaneously.

These objectives are then refined, discussed in detail, and presented to the college's board for their concurrence. After the adoption of the institutional objectives, they are distributed to the entire college community: the faculty, the staff, the students (through the college newspaper), and the public through the local news media. The objectives are made the focus of faculty, administration, and board attention for the year.

Individual Objectives

The evaluation plan at Wytheville Community College provides that each person with faculty rank develop a plan for the year which includes a set of seven specific performance objectives and a program to achieve these objectives. The objectives

are selected by the individual and focus on helping the institution meet its objectives as well as personal and professional development activities. The objectives are written so as to provide measurable indicators and are classified into four general categories: institutional objectives, student evaluation of the instructor, faculty developed institutional objectives, and self or peer opinion.

In regard to institutional objectives, each instructor and administrator develops two performance objectives which relate to the institutional objectives for the year and which includes a program which focuses on increased student learning as determined by direct measurement. Also, each instructor develops two performance objectives which focus on opportunities for improvement in the classroom as indicated by student evaluation from the Purdue Rating Scale for Instruction. In the case of administrators, the faculty evaluation of administrators is used. Each instructor/administrator develops two performance objectives which relate to opportunities for improvement as determined by the faculty developed institutional objectives and each staff member must develop one performance objective which relates to self or peer identified goal for improvement.

Each instructor/administrator is expected to make a sincere effort to establish his/her objectives for the year within these general guidelines. The division chairmen, in the case of teaching faculty, act as a consultant or coach assisting the instructor in developing his objectives in a meaningful way and in helping him achieve them during the year. This approach is essential to the division chairmen in building rapport with faculty members in his division.

The Dean of Instruction is the approving authority for objectives in the case of teaching faculty while the president is the approving authority for all other professional employees. (In larger institutions a different administrative structure for the development and approval of objectives might be more appropriate.) The objectives thus developed become the focus of teacher/administration attention for the year providing for a forward looking mechanism for individual personal and professional improvement.

Evaluation

It is the sincere belief of the Wytheville Community College staff that the process of performance evaluation is far more significant than the measurable results which may be secured at the end of the year. The process of evaluation begins at the individual level with the faculty member completing a self evaluation on a periodic basis during the year and a final evaluation at the end of the year. Again, the division chairman acts as a consultant to the faculty member and assists him in accessing his improvement during the year. Evaluation is based on a very simple scale:

U - Clearly unsatisfactory progress toward meeting objectives
S - Satisfactory progress toward meeting objectives
O - Clearly outstanding progress toward meeting objectives

The evaluation is used to assist the instructor and his superiors and the college in setting institutional and individual objectives for the coming year. Thus, it provides a forward looking mechanism. The college administration also prepares a detailed analysis of the efforts of the college to achieve the institutional objectives for the year. This analysis is presented to the board for its evaluation of the college. The

evaluations on the individual and institutional level are presented in such a way as to give direction for future objectives and programs. The administration, faculty, and board use the evaluations to develop the institutional objectives for the next year. Long-range goals and means of their achievement may also need revision if evaluations so indicate.

In summary, the Wytheville Community College performance evaluation plan adapts McGregor's Theory of Management by Integration and Self Control to an institution of higher education. During the pilot stage of the development of this program, participation has been on a voluntary basis in regard to merit salary increases in an effort to relieve any anxieties about its purpose.

During the first stage of development the plan appears to be promising especially in regard to the focusing of attention on a set of institutional goals. The frequency of response analysis techniques developed can be a very useful tool in identifying problems and solutions to problems in colleges which are larger and far more complex than Wytheville.

CHAPTER FIVE

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STATE SYSTEMS

If a state system is committed to developing a program of accountability for its products and productivity, a plan for institutional evaluation and personnel motivation is an essential element as the system is dependent on those individuals within it for an effective program. All available evidence would indicate that as growth in enrollments and the need for expansion of facilities begin to level off an increased emphasis on the effectiveness with which institutions utilize those human and material resources at their disposal will be central to a program of accountability. Thus the development of all individuals within each college on a continuing basis will be essential for effectiveness improvement.

The question is then what should or what can a state board do to provide for increased individual and institutional effectiveness through a performance evaluation program? Integration of objectives and individual control are essential elements of the program described in this paper and the following are recommendations for state level initiation of such an evaluation scheme.

1. <u>The state board should give prime emphasis to college evaluation through a system of institutional objectives.</u> Guidelines for the development of these objectives which seek to improve the system's accountability for its basic purposes as well as meeting local needs is essential to this type of management system. Objectives should be so written as to provide measurable indicators, and definite plans for achieving these should be a part of the program. Plans should anticipate resources needed to achieve institutional objectives (perhaps a system such as PPBS). It goes without saying that institutional objectives should complement system objectives and goals.

2. Institutional and individual accountability for improving the products and productivity of each institution as well as the state system should be the primary objective of evaluation. As enrollments begin to level out, institutions of higher education will be forced to base their requests for additional funds on additional services and improved quality of services delivered instead of projected enrollment increases. Central to this situation will be increased emphasis on the quality of instruction. Past practices of controlling quality through high attrition rates will prove to be unacceptable in the years ahead as our technological society demands more and more technical skills from each individual. Thus, increased emphasis on whether the student is being provided with appropriate learning opportunities will be the focus of the American public in the years ahead.

3. The basic duties and responsibilities of the instructors should be clearly understood by all parties. This is essential if systems and institutions are to foster innovation and improvement in the teaching process. Objectives of individuals and institutions should focus on innovations in either problem areas or areas which are currently satisfactory but are susceptible to improvement in light of modern educational technology. It would appear that these duties and responsibilities should be developed on a system-wide basis if possible.

4. Every effort should be made to ensure that faculty evaluation is highly individualized. It is commonly conceded that students learn differently and that instruction in so far as practical should be individualized. This is essentially true for instructors and teaching styles and evaluation of instructors should be individualized to allow for maximizing individual talent. In the past state level attitudes have leaned toward rigid evaluation programs which have included such practices as quarterly classroom visitations. Such practices have not been noted for their successes, are very time consuming, and should be avoided.

5. Individual commitment to institutional and system objectives should be fostered through extensive involvement in the development of both long-range and short-range objectives as well as in the development of the evaluation system itself. The key to a viable management system in an institution of higher education, just as in industry, is the development of a system which stimulates the individual within the organization to commit himself to the goals of the institution and which also meets the needs and goals of the individual himself.

In summary, it is sufficient to say that the role of a state system in this type of evaluation plan would be limited to a management by objectives type system featuring guidelines, policies, and/or coordination. This type of management system would emphasize: highly individualized institutional and individual evaluation; a program for improvement on a continuing basis; accountability for use of resources; and most important the utilization of the modern motivational theories of American management as the foundation of an institutional management system.

FOOTNOTES

[1]John Dewey, Human Nature and Conduct (New York: Modern Library, 1930), pp. 314-317.

[2]J. Wade Gilley, "Faculty Personnel Policies at Six Selected Colleges," Wytheville Community College, Wytheville, Virginia, 1968. (Typewritten.)

[3]James L. Evanko, "Faculty Evaluation: A Project Report," in The Second Annual Pennsylvania Conference on Post-Secondary Occupational Education, ed. by Angelo C. Gillie, Report from the Center for the Study of Higher Education, Pennsylvania State University, June, 1971 (University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University, 1971), pp. 42-48.

[4]J. Marvin Cook and Richard F. Neville, The Faculty as Teachers: A Perspective on Evaluation, Report 13 in a series of reports on various aspects of higher education, ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, September, 1971 (Washington, D. C.: George Washington University, 1971), p. 1.

[5]Bruce J. Biddle, "The Integration of Teacher Effectiveness Research," in Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness, ed. by B. J. Biddle and W. J. Ellena (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1964).

[6]Cook and Neville, The Faculty as Teachers: A Perspective on Evaluation, p. 6.

[7]Ibid., p. 3.

[8]The Richmond-Times Dispatch, Richmond, Virginia, on February 23, 1970, reported on a faculty evaluation plan being used on an experimental basis at John Tyler Community College, Chester, Virginia. Basically, the plan provided for merit increases for those professors whose students achieved X percentage of certain predetermined specific behavioral objectives. Each of the participating faculty members entered into a specific contract with the college administration to this effect.

[9]Arthur M. Cohen and Florence B. Brawer, Measuring Faculty Performance (Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges for the ERIC Clearinghouse of Junior College Information, 1969), pp. 70-72.

[10]Ibid., p. 62.

[11]John E. Roueche, George A. Baker, and Richard L. Brownell, Accountability and the Community College: Directions for the 70's (Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1971), p. 14.

[12]Cook and Neville, The Faculty as Teachers: A Perspective on Evaluation, pp. 9-10.

[13]Douglas McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960), pp. 61-76.

[14]Ibid., pp. 33-43.

[15]A. H. Maslow, Motivation and Personality (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1954), pp. 80-106.

[16]F. J. Roethlisberger and William J. Dickson, Management and The Worker (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964).

[17]McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise, pp. 47-48.

[18]J. Wade Gilley, "Personnel Evaluation: A Key to Accountability" (paper presented at a conference on Accountability in the Community College, Lambton College, Sarnia, Ontario, August, 1971).

[19]Wytheville Community College, "Faculty Evaluation Plan: 1971-1972," Wytheville, Va., 1971. (Mimeographed.)

[20]Wytheville Community College, "Criteria for Board Evaluation of College Effectiveness," Wytheville, Va., 1971. (Mimeographed.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Biddle, Bruce J. "The Integration of Teacher Effectiveness Research." Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness. Edited by B. J. Biddle and W. J. Ellena. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1964.

Cohen, Arthur M. Dateline '79: Heretical Concepts for the Community College. Beverly Hills, Cal.: Glencoe Press, 1969.

Cohen, Arthur M., and Brawer, Florence B. Measuring Faculty Performance. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges for the ERIC Clearinghouse of Junior College Information, 1969.

Cook, J. Marvin, and Neville, Richard F. The Faculty as Teachers: A Perspective on Evaluation. Report 13 in a series of reports on various aspects of higher education, ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, September, 1971. Washington, D. C.: George Washington University, 1971.

Dewey, John. Human Nature and Conduct. New York: Modern Library, 1930.

Evanko, James L. "Faculty Evaluation: A Project Report." The Second Annual Pennsylvania Conference on Post-Secondary Occupational Education. Edited by Angelo C. Gillie. Report from the Center for the Study of Higher Education, Pennsylvania State University, June, 1971. University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University, 1971.

Gilley, J. Wade. "Faculty Personnel Policies at Six Selected Colleges," Wytheville Community College, Wytheville, Virginia, 1968. (Typewritten.)

Gilley, J. Wade. "Personnel Evaluation: A Key to Accountability." Paper presented at a conference on Accountability in the Community College, Lambton College, Sarnia, Ontario, August, 1971.

Johnson, B. Lamar. Islands of Innovation Expanding: Changes in the Community College. Beverly Hills, Cal.: Glencoe Press, 1969.

McGregor, Douglas. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.

Maslow, A. H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1954.

Odiorne, George S. Management Decisions by Objectives. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.

Roethlisberger, F. J., and Dickson, William J. Management and The Worker. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964.

Roueche, John E.; Baker, George A.; and Brownell, Richard L. Accountability and the Community College: Directions for the 70's. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1971.

Wytheville Community College. "Criteria for Board Evaluation of College Effectiveness," Wytheville, Va., 1971. (Mimeographed.)

Wytheville Community College. "Faculty Evaluation Plan: 1971-1972," Wytheville, Va., 1971. (Mimeographed.)

University of Florida
1853